

Town Meeting



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

BROADCAST BY STATIONS OF THE AMERICAN BROADCASTING CO.



Is Russia Preventing Peace at Paris?

Moderator, GEORGE V. DENNY, JR.

Speakers

A. A. BERLE, JR.

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN

Interrogators

H. V. KALTENBORN

QUINCY HOWE

(See also page 12)

COMING

—September 12, 1946—

**Should Commercial Building Be Curtailed
To Provide Homes for Veterans?**

—September 19, 1946—

Are We Heading for War With Russia?

Published by THE TOWN HALL, Inc., New York 18, N.Y.

★ ★ ★ C O N T E N T S ★ ★ ★

The account of the meeting reported in this Bulletin was transcribed from recordings made of the actual broadcast and represents the exact content of the meeting as nearly as such mechanism permits. The publishers and printer are not responsible for the statements of the speakers or the points of view presented.

THE BROADCAST OF SEPTEMBER 5:

"Is Russia Preventing Peace at Paris?"

Mr. DENNY.....	3
Mr. BERLE.....	4
Dr. SCHUMAN.....	7
Mr. KALTENBORN.....	10
Mr. HOWE.....	11
THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN.....	12
QUESTIONS, PLEASE!.....	17

THE BROADCAST OF SEPTEMBER 12:

"Should Commercial Building Be Curtailed To Provide Homes for Veterans?"

THE BROADCAST OF SEPTEMBER 19:

"Are We Heading for War With Russia?"

The Broadcast of September 5, 1946, originated in Town Hall, in New York City, from 8:30 to 9:30 p.m., E.D.T., over the American Broadcasting Co. Network.

Town Meeting is published by The Town Hall, Inc., Town Meeting Publication Office: 400 S. Front St., Columbus 15, Ohio. Send subscriptions and single copy orders to Town Hall, 123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y. Subscription price, \$4.50 a year, 10c a copy. Entered as second-class matter, May 9, 1942, at the Post Office at Columbus, Ohio, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Illinois U Library *Town Meeting*



BULLETIN OF AMERICA'S TOWN MEETING OF THE AIR

GEORGE V. DENNY, JR., MODERATOR



SEPTEMBER 5, 1946

VOL. 12, No. 19

Is Russia Preventing Peace at Paris?

Announcer:

Friends, we're back home in Town Hall, New York, for the 438th session of America's Town Meeting of the Air. We're welcoming back to his accustomed place the founder and moderator of America's Town Meeting, president of Town Hall, New York, Mr. George V. Denny, Jr. Mr. Denny. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Good evening, neighbors. I feel very much like saying "Thanks for letting me come back" after that splendid array of guest moderators you had this summer. I know you share with me the appreciation we all feel toward Mrs. Marian Carter, the head of our Radio Forum Division, and her assistant, Mrs. Elizabeth Colclough, who arranged the excellent programs we've been having. Let's give them a hand! You don't see them very often! (*Applause.*)

Now those of you who've been following America's Town Meetings over the years will recall that we've experimented at various times with programs having two principal speakers and two interrogators. Tonight we are returning to that format as we believe it'll help to clarify the essential issues and will increase our understanding of the conflicts and agreements on each Town Meeting topic.

On tonight's question, "Is Russia Preventing Peace at Paris?" Mr. A. A. Berle, Jr., former Assistant Secretary of State, and Dr. Frederick L. Schuman, of Williams College, will present the case for the affirmative and the negative, respectively. Then Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn and Mr. Quincy Howe, leading American news analysts, who have frequently taken opposite sides on this program, will each make a sharp analysis of

each speech and introduce our discussion period.

Now, should Mr. Berle or Dr. Schuman attempt to evade or not answer a question from this representative audience — which, of course, they won't—Mr. Kaltenborn and Mr. Howe will be quick to pounce upon them and demand an explanation on your behalf.

Tonight, the eyes of the world are centered on Paris where the representatives of 21 nations are striving—or should be striving—to make a durable peace. The wave of unrest and disaffection among delegates at Paris has been reflected in news reports all over the world. The struggle for peace has become a war of nerves, as the great powers maneuver for advantage in the dangerous game of power politics.

We, the people, are puzzled and alarmed. What was the meaning of Molotov's sudden dash to Moscow after his angry denunciation of his Anglo-American colleagues?

What's behind Russia's attack on Greece, both in Paris and in the Security Council here?

Why did the Soviet Republic seek to delay or transfer the meeting of the United Nations Assembly from New York to the Continent of Europe? Perhaps none of us knows the answer to this question, but we can think.

Instead of building a durable peace, are our representatives sowing the seeds of another World

War? Two and a half billions of human beings have a life and death stake in this question?

Mr. Berle, as our Assistant Secretary of State for seven years and a close confidant of our late President, and one of his advisors, will you give us your opinion on tonight's question, "Is Russia Preventing Peace at Paris?" Mr. Berle. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Berle:

Mr. Denny, the question, "Is Russia Preventing Peace at Paris?" has two prongs—one short and one long, and the short one only relates to the immediate situation about whether she is delaying peace at Paris. There, I think the answer is clear and must be "yes," though there is more in it than that. For the record, there is that the Soviet Union wanted the foreign ministers of the great Three Powers to agree on drafts of the treaties. They struggled for months and produced few results, and, after a last try, Byrnes proposed the Paris Conference, but the Soviet Union objected and agreed reluctantly only when he offered to throw the whole thing into the United Nations.

So the Paris Conference met. The Soviet Union still didn't like it. The debates have been carried on on their side altogether to much like a Huey Long filibuster.

They even stimulated enemies of Bulgaria to dismember Greece, a heroic ally, which would make o

of Greece about what Hitler made out of Czechoslovakia.

I think historians will have to record that the Soviet foreign office wanted to fight a delaying action, believing that time worked for the Soviet national interest. It's the oldest diplomatic dodge in the world.

But that's short range. The long range prong probes a deeper situation. Is the Soviet Union delaying not only peace at Paris, but the whole rebuilding of world peace? I think the answer there, too, is "yes," but she shares that responsibility with some other people, too, for Paris cannot even discuss the big questions—the fate of Germany and Austria, the Near East, the colonial peoples, economic reconstructions—and while those are unsolved nothing can be solved.

Peace building began in 1941 with the Atlantic Charter. That was the only war aims document which made much sense to the world and it was ratified by the common man everywhere. With that as a base Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin did reach a partial agreement at Teheran and at Yalta.

German militarism was to be destroyed, the enemy countries were to be run as units by the three powers working together. Against Roosevelt's urging, that territory was split into three zones of army occupation—Russian, British, American. But the United

Nations was to be promptly formed, the Atlantic Charter was to be reaffirmed, liberated countries were to choose their own government by free elections, the Polish boundary was agreed to—not what Mr. Roosevelt wanted, as he said, but the best he could get—and the governments of Poland, Bulgaria, Rumania, Yugoslavia were to be free and democratic, and some of these agreements have not been kept.

I'm clear from my contact with President Roosevelt after Yalta that he was driving towards a co-operative community of nations based on a universal good neighbor policy under the leadership of the Big Three, but, even before Yalta, extremists in various countries were working against him and against this, hoping to profit by postwar confusion.

Few nations are wholly guiltless here and the Soviet Union has a heavy share. She had an under-cover struggle in her own country between her moderates and her reactionaries. These last wanted to revert to the expansionist policy of the czars, which would convert their drive for a world revolution into an imperial drive, much as Napoleon reconverted the French revolution in his time.

The reactionaries won that fight. They then began attacks against every government, not communist dominated, in language both insulting and absurd. Their doctrine

meant in practice that Russian puppets would control as they do Rumania, Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, and perhaps even also Poland, and the zones of army occupation agreed to at Yalta became separate provinces with armed frontiers. The joint government by the Allies in Germany and other defeated countries disappeared and apparently some of them are even prepared to gamble with the peace of the world to obtain their ends in Trieste, in Italy, in Greece, in Turkey, in the Near East, in China, and the hairline which separates world revolution from a Napoleonic empire threatens to be crossed.

There were extremists, too, in Britain, and in France, and in other countries. Some British statesmen, gallant in war, did also represent empire, Kipling style. Some of these talked of re-arming Germany as a buffer state against Russia, and expanding the British Empire beyond Burma or nailing down greater imperial zones of monopoly and transport and trade.

As Professor Schuman has himself pointed out in some brilliant essays that he has written, the extremists fed each other. Britains could say truly that Russian extremists hated Britain and planned her downfall, and be right. Russians could fear the British extremists wanted the old Munich diplomacy back. Mutual fear was

the meat of both, with propaganda and fifth column their method.

Now all this kind of thing only leads to delay and crises, endeavors to seize territory by conquest or bought revolutions, or revolution or invasions from the outside with a whole bag of sordid tricks which will delay real peace.

I think Americans are tired of it. Roosevelt left us the good neighbor policy and the Atlantic Charter. We can and will fight world domination from any quarter, but we also have the strength and the resources to back all-out the Atlantic Charter and the good neighbor policy.

I think the masses everywhere want just that and are tired of wild talk, whether from Moscow or from any other quarter. For despite the Soviet propaganda, the British Government is changing the Kipling empire and did not follow her extremists and is endeavoring to set India on the road to freedom, wants a free Greece and would disarm in the Near East if it did not mean simply turning over that area to the Russians through armies or puppets and hopes, I think, to develop her colonial empire into a system of the commonwealth of nations.

Many Soviet statesmen know too, that empire is no permanent solution for Russia. She, too, must find some better way than holding down captive populations. If men of good will in all the countries

assert themselves in good neighborhood, the job can be done. Trieste will be easy when Trieste stops being a pawn in power politics and so for the other questions. While we can lament the lost year of 1945, and peacemaking is harder now than it was if we had squarely met the issue, it is not yet too late. The guilt of World War III will rest on those who failed to meet their questions with reason and justice instead of with force. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Berle. I should have mentioned that Mr. Berle returned to the practice of law as well as to his position as a member of the faculty of Columbia University. The other side of the question, "Is Russia Preventing Peace at Paris," will be presented by a distinguished author and professor of political science at Williams College who has made the study of Russian foreign policy his specialty. Dr. Frederick L. Schuman. Dr. Schuman. (*Applause.*)

Dr. Schuman:

Mr. Moderator and friends. At the risk of disappointing those of you who want a knock-down, drag-out fight here this evening, I must say at the very outset that it seems to me an enormously hopeful and heartening thing to have a distinguished public figure, like Mr. Berle, admit publicly that

Soviet attitudes and policies are not exclusively responsible for all of our present difficulties and that British attitudes and policies and even American attitudes and policies share some portion of the responsibility.

America's favorite indoor sport during the past year has been to blame Moscow for all the ills of the world. Our world is so full of doubts, insecurities, and troubles that if the Russians did not exist to be blamed for them, they would have to be invented for the purpose. (*Applause.*)

It is easy to find and blame scapegoats. It is hard to think straight and act constructively with regard to present international problems. Mr. Berle has chosen the hard way, which is the only hopeful way, and I, for one, rejoice that he has. Wherein we differ will appear as we proceed.

My contention tonight would be that Russia is not preventing peace at Paris. No one is preventing peace at Paris. Everyone in Paris from Montparnasse to the Cafe de la Paix is making peace. Like Parisian life itself, peace is not an inner status but a living process. The Romans had a word for it—"pax" meaning agreement. The Slavs have a word for it, "mir" meaning in Russian peace, concord, community, and universe.

Concord is always less exciting than discord because we all love a good fight. But I submit that

behind the quarreling and quibbling, which accompany all peace-making, concord is growing in the Luxembourg Palace. It's leading toward a new community whose members can, if they will, build the universal federal union of the days to come, without which there can be very little hope for mankind in the atomic age.

The tasks of Paris are limited tasks but they are tasks essential to the larger duty of keeping faith with the dead and assuring to the living the fruits of victory over fascism. Despite the preachers of fear and hate and the prophets of gloom and doom, these tasks are being fulfilled. The draft treaties which the conference is considering are compromises among divergent views and interests. For Americans to compromise with Russians is as difficult as it is for Russians to compromise with Americans, for each people tends to believe that it has a monopoly of virtue, while the other has a monopoly of vice.

Fortunately, neither Mr. Byrnes nor Mr. Molotov has followed the example of the Red Queen who replied, when Alice said, "I've lost my way," "I don't know what you mean by your way, all the ways around here belong to me."

No doubt we should be happier if the Russians followed our ways in all respects, and no doubt the Russians would be happier if we followed Russian ways in all re-

spects. But this cannot be. We must together find and follow a middle way if there is to be peace.

The draft treaties record almost complete agreement on political, military, territorial, and reparation problems. Agreement has not yet been reached on economic terms, but agreement will be reached here, too.

Current delays are not in my judgment due to Russian obstructionism. The Soviet Union, which suffered war losses ten times greater than all the Western Allies combined, has greater need for enduring peace than any other nation.

The troubles of the peacemakers are due to other causes: First, to the fact that the conference is grappling with the tangled issues left by another thirty years' war. The first battle of the Marne began 32 years ago tonight.

Second, to the fact that the United States has insisted on open diplomacy in Paris. Open diplomacy, while easy in theory is hard in practice for it does make compromise more difficult.

Third, to the fact that the United States has insisted on asking the advice and recommendations of the lesser powers. Advice is cheap and recommendations are a dime a dozen, as is shown by the three hundred amendments already proposed. Twenty-one cooks may spoil the broth. But if there be a fault there, it is

I think, an American fault rather than a Soviet fault.

However, the basic difficulty in Paris is that the wartime Allies are pursuing one another around a vicious circle of suspicion and fear with diplomats and strategists still walking in their sleep as if Hiroshima had never happened.

America and Russia have become rivals for power, with each accusing the other of designs for world domination and with lunatics in both camps preparing for World War III, which would mean ultimate victory for fascism and the atomization of the world community.

Until we establish world government to control atomic energy, which we are bound to do if we wish to survive, there is only one way of restoring confidence among the giant powers of today. That way is for the Soviet Union and the Atlantic democracies to return to the spirit of Yalta and Potsdam and to recognize that each has special security interests in particular areas which the others are bound to respect.

The war over the peace is chiefly due to Anglo-American reluctance to grant that Eastern Europe and the Balkans north of Greece constitute a Slavic security zone in which the U.S.S.R. has a right to political influence, strategic control, and special trade arrangements just as Britain and America have similar rights which Moscow

has a duty to respect over most of the rest of the great globe itself.

The current game of thrust and parry in these shadow lands between two worlds can lead only to tragedy. By challenging Soviet hegemony in Eastern Europe, the western powers can evoke Soviet counter challenges and can breed suspicion and friction in future war. But such policy can never achieve the avowed Anglo-American objectives of political democracy and freedom of trade.

Like Calvin Coolidge's preacher, we're all against sin but war is the greatest sin for its wages now are death for all.

Peace demands that America cease its crusade to save all the world from Soviet sin. Peace demands that the Soviet Union cease its crusade to save all the world from capitalist sin.

Through mutual tolerance and reciprocal abstention from holy wars, the leaders of East and West can complete the present treaties and find subsequent solutions to the problems posed by Germany, China, Japan, and the atomic bombs.

I feel certain that these things will be done because they must be done. The alternative is the suicide of our civilization. Let us disenthral ourselves from fear and self-righteousness alike. Let us raise our eyes to the horizons

of the future. Let us choose the road to life. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Dr. Schuman. Well, Dr. Schuman, if you were speaking for the Russians and Mr. Berle were speaking for the Americans, it wouldn't be very hard to make peace in Paris—at least in New York.

Now it's the regular business of Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn and Mr. Quincy Howe to analyze statements of politicians and statesmen but they customarily have the air all to themselves, and they sometimes view the same events quite differently.

Tonight we're going to ask each of them to give a two minute analysis of the statements we have just heard. Then we'll have our discussion around the microphone and questions from this representative audience. We'll start with the Dean, the Dean of American commentators. Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Kaltenborn:

The fundamental defect of Dr. Schuman's presentation is that he failed to mention the word communism in any part of his address. (*Applause.*) The fundamental conflict between the United States and Russia is communism. Communism never surrenders. Communism never gives up. Communism always argues in a certain way. Communism has stated again

and again that there can be no reconciliation between communism and capitalism, that there must be war. We are having that war now in Paris.

He says there has been some concord. I don't know where it is. I have before me a list of the day's events, day after day, since it began. It is nothing but a repetition of:

Molotov warns Italian people against collaboration with the United States.

Russia blocks ports in Bulgarian claims against Greece.

Russia opposes giving vote to France.

Russia opposes bearing Austria on South Tyrol.

Russia insists on having its satellites on board to govern Trieste port.

Soviet opposes interference with its bilateral reparations agreements.

Soviet denounces suggestion of court of human rights.

Soviet opposes freedom of Danube traffic.

Russia opposes Australia's right to suggest changes in draft treaties.

And so on and so forth. (*Applause.*) If that marks any progress towards concord I'd like to have him explain it.

He goes on to tell us, "treaties record almost complete agreement." They do not. Thirty-three points of disagreement, and they are practically all on major issues. Out of twenty-seven major issues

so far debated, Russia opposes the democratic world on eighteen.

He says "the United States has insisted on asking the advice and recommendations of the lesser powers." Does he mean to exclude Australia, New Zealand, Belgium, Holland, Brazil, who shed their blood in this war, from the making of the peace. (*Applause.*)

He speaks of "Anglo-American reluctance to grant Eastern Europe and the Balkans all to Russia." Why do we insist that it should not be granted? Because we want to get back to the spirit of Yalta of which he speaks, but it is Russia that has gone away from that spirit, that has violated it, that has taken every concession that we made and that has refused to grant a single thing that it promised at Yalta whether it was the democracy of Poland or whether it was the opening of Bulgaria and Rumania to free elections.

Naturally, peace demands that America cease its crusade to save all the world from Soviet sin—communist sin, and we are not going to stop arguing against communist sin. While communism dominates a small group of men in the Kremlin who are devoted to that, and to that alone, and who through technicalities and continued arguments and continued obstructions, block the making of peace, we will go on saying, "Yes, Russia blocks the peace at Paris." (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn. I tell you it's dangerous to tangle with the Dean. (*Laughter.*) I am sure that Dr. Schuman and Mr. Berle have made notes of your observations Mr. Kaltenborn. Now let's hear from another distinguished editor and commentator, Mr. Quincy Howe, who has three minutes. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Howe:

Dean Kaltenborn has just used the word "communism" so often that I don't think I need to use it again. (*Laughter.*) Maybe he will let me take a cut from that class. But, if Dr. Schuman approves of what Mr. Berle has said, who am I to disapprove? I am simply going to try to make a few what I hope are constructive points in connection with his remarks.

Mr. Berle rather tended to criticize the slow progress of the Paris Conference, and Mr. Kaltenborn did more than criticize.

Did the rapid progress of the World War I Peace Conference assure us any better treaty, any better settlement? Is speed in a settlement necessarily good in and of itself? Are the Allies of Paris today even as close as they were 25 years ago? I don't think so. They are not so close, certainly, as our two main speakers here are tonight — Dr. Schuman seeing Yalta as the model on which the world should operate, the great powers from now on, the model

THE SPEAKERS' COLUMN

ADOLPH AUGUSTUS BERLE, JR.—A lawyer and a former Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Berle is also a former Ambassador to Brazil. He was born in Boston, Massachusetts, in 1895. He has an A.B. degree, an A.M., and an LL.B. from Harvard University. He entered the practice of law in New York City in 1916 and is now a partner in the office of Berle & Berle.

From 1925 to 1928, Mr. Berle was a lecturer on finance at Harvard Business School. He has also been an associate professor of corporation law at Columbia Law School since 1927.

During World War I, Mr. Berle served in the Infantry and was on the staff of the American Commission to Negotiate Peace with Germany. He has been a special counsel for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, a financial adviser of the American Embassy in Cuba, and a chamberlain of New York City. In 1938, he became Assistant Secretary of State. In January, 1945, he was appointed Ambassador to Brazil, a position from which he resigned last February.

Mr. Berle is the author of several books and magazine articles on financial matters.

FREDERICK L. SCHUMAN—Dr. Schuman was born in Chicago in 1904. In 1924, he was granted a Ph.B. degree from the University of Chicago and, in 1927, a Ph.D. degree from the same university. For nine years, he served as instructor and assistant professor of political science at his alma mater. Since 1936, he has been professor of political science at Williams College, and Woodrow Wilson professor of government since July 1, 1938. During the war he was a political analyst in the foreign broadcast intelligence service of the Federal Communications Commission. As a lecturer, author, and contributor to magazines, Dr. Schuman is an authority on European affairs. His most recent books include *The Nazi Dictatorship, Germany Since 1918, Europe on the Eve, Night Over Europe*, and *Soviet Politics*.

HANS V. KALTENBORN—Dean of radio commentators, H. V. Kaltenborn made his first news broadcast in 1922. Born in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Mr. Kaltenborn was graduated from Harvard in 1909 with an A.B. cum laude. Since then, he has received several honorary degrees. For twenty years, 1910-1930, he was associated with the Brooklyn *Eagle*. In 1930, he left the *Eagle* for WABC, key station for the Columbia network. Since 1940, he has been with the National Broadcasting Company. Mr. Kaltenborn has been radio reporter for many political conventions, League of Nations sessions, Pan American Peace Conferences, and the like. His honors and citations for meritorious radio reporting are too numerous to mention. He was awarded a gold plaque for the best foreign radio reporting covering the Spanish front in 1936, when he made possible the first radio transmission of artillery and machine-gun fire during actual combat. Mr. Kaltenborn is the author of several books and many magazine articles. Among his books are *We Look at the World*, *Kaltenborn Edits the News* and *I Broadcast the Crisis*. Mr. Kaltenborn, who has traveled widely, has a knowledge of several foreign languages including French, German, and Italian.

QUINCY HOWE—Mr. Howe, a radio news commentator since 1939, has been with the Columbia Broadcasting System since 1942. Born in Boston in 1900, he received his A.B. degree from Harvard in 1921. The following year he was a student at Christ's College, in Cambridge, England. From 1922 to 1928, he was with the Atlantic Monthly Company; from 1929 to 1935, he was editor of *Living Age*; and since 1935, he has been associated with Simon and Schuster, Inc.

In 1939, Mr. Howe became a news commentator on station WQRX in New York, and in 1942 joined CBS. Mr. Howe is the author of *World Diary* ((1929-34), *England Expects Every Man To Do His Duty* (1937), *Blood Is Cheaper Than Water* (1939), and *The News and How To Understand It* (1940).

of sort of give and take, and Mr. Berle seeing the Atlantic Charter as the model from which he feels we have backslid.

Mr. Berle makes a greater emphasis on principle; Dr. Schuman a greater emphasis on the necessity

of give and take, and I'm with Dr. Schuman on that.

As for President Roosevelt's emphasis on a cooperative community based on the Big Three—sure, we're all for that, but we had reached no major agreement on

that even at the time Mr. Roosevelt died.

Neither speaker gave enough emphasis, for my taste, to the importance of revolution in the world today. Mr. Berle spoke of the thin line between imperialism and revolution. I don't think it's so thin, and I think the revolutionary forces operating in the world today are far stronger, far stronger everywhere than any imperialist force.

Don't, perhaps, the Russians know more about this force of revolution than some of the rest? Isn't that, perhaps, why they seem to be doing better than some of the others?

Mr. Berle speaks of the guilt for World War III. But, surely, on his own showing, and, I think, on the showing that Dr. Schuman has indicated, and even in the belligerence of Mr. Kaltenborn's remarks, which after all are only remarks because I know he's not really a belligerent person, (*laughter*) it is not war that anybody is ready for. Russia is weary of war. They're not going to fight a war. We, certainly, are strongly antiwar—you can feel that clearly enough.

Isn't the danger rather a danger of continued drift? Isn't the hope that somewhere along the line there will be some kind of show-down of the people at the top who can control this drift perhaps more than the people who are executing

policy from day to day, that the black and white approach and this hasty business widens the rift?

I prefer Mr. Schuman's approach because I think he is telling us to go slow now. Don't talk too much about broad principles. Anybody can apply a principle. The Devil can quote scripture. Anyone can quote the Atlantic Charter. Let's try to agree on specific things. Go slow now. Then we may have hope later. (*Applause.*)

Moderator Denny:

Thank you, Quincy Howe. Well, Mr. Berle, I expect you and Dr. Schuman had better get on your feet and join us up here around the microphone. Mr. Berle, we haven't heard from you for awhile. Perhaps you would like to tackle some of Mr. Howe's observations.

Mr. Berle: They are interesting observations, but I would like to point out that the questions which are being raised now are not broad questions of principle from the Russian side. They are questions whether Greece shall cede Thrace; whether Turkey shall substantially abandon her independence, half of it to the Soviet Armenia and the other half to the Soviet ports on the Dardanelles, and a few things of that kind. The attack comes from that side.

It seems to me that as long as that kind of thing is going on, you can't merely talk of it as being simple abstraction.

I'd like to say one thing and then get out of the way for a moment. I think this situation is a great deal graver than most people do. It's not been nice to say that there's danger of war. I think there is. We have leaped from crisis to crisis and the time will come when there comes the crisis that you can't get over. Meanwhile, there are great lines of armed men facing each other. It is not a pretty situation, and we have to deal swiftly with cases. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Berle. Now, Dr. Schuman, would you like to take over where Mr. Kaltenborn left off or where Mr. Berle left off?

Dr. Schuman: I'll try both, Mr. Moderator. It seems to me that most of us are convinced that the attack, as Mr. Berle puts it, is coming from the Soviet side. It's perfectly clear that most of the Soviet people are convinced that the attack is coming from our side. We are, therefore, confronted with an extremely dangerous and grave situation with a vicious circle which we must somehow break out of.

As for Mr. Kaltenborn's remarks, I did not refer explicitly to the fact that the leaders of the Soviet Union are communists because I thought that was generally known. (*Applause.*) Mr. Kaltenborn said, quite wrongly in my judgment and I think I know the documents as well as he does, that

the communist leaders of the Soviet Union are saying constantly that war is inevitable with democratic capitalism. I'm not aware that any of them has said that since 1929 and if there are some people in the Soviet Union who think that war is inevitable, I suggest that they get that idea, not from reading Marx and Engels and Lenin, nor even from reading Stalin's speeches, they get that idea from what they hear about the content of a certain portion of the press of the United States of America. (*Applause.*)

I would have supposed that a man of Mr. Kaltenborn's experience in journalism would know by now that American newspaper headlines are not necessarily accurate guides to world affairs. (*Applause.*)

The question is raised as to whether I would be in favor of excluding Australia, New Zealand, and lesser powers from the Peace Conference. Certainly not. I was merely seeking to call attention to the fact that agreement was reached at Potsdam thirteen months ago—and it wasn't an agreement imposed by Moscow, as I think Mr. Berle implied—and it was an agreement reached by the United States, Great Britain, and the Soviet Union jointly that the peace treaty with these particular states should be drafted by a council of foreign ministers representing the Big Four. It was

subsequently agreed, again as a matter of a joint Anglo-American-Soviet agreement, that it should be a conference of 21 states limited to the power of recommendation only.

The 21 delegates in Paris have only the power of recommendation with regard to these treaties and the treaties are finally to be drafted by the Big Four for better or worse. There has been agreement. Seventy-eight articles of the Italian treaty, 37 articles of the Hungarian treaty, 38 articles of the Rumanian treaty, 36 articles of the Bulgarian treaty, 34 articles of the Finnish treaty—that's 223 articles and that's a whale of a lot of agreements. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Dr. Schuman. Now, Mr. Kaltenborn, won't you step up?

Mr. Kaltenborn: The number is, as Dr. Schuman states, about 221 things that have been agreed upon and 33 have been disagreed upon. But every one of the 33 is a major item and most of the 221 are minor items. (*Applause.*) If you want to know such subjects as freedom of navigation on the Danube — there we've struck a blank wall. We've made no progress whatever. We've made no progress on anything that goes on behind the iron curtain.

Obviously unless we can get agreement on some of those things, unless there can be some concession, some cooperation from Rus-

sia towards the actual making of peace, and not this continued bickering on minor points of strategy and procedure and so on, we're never going to get a peace.

After all, it's not the Russian people of which Dr. Schuman speaks that are concerned. Yes, a certain portion of the American press voices one opinion, and another portion voices another, and the Soviet Union is very careful to quote only one portion and never the other. (*Applause.*)

What I have cited were not headlines but were facts which he knows as well as I do. As far as the Soviet press is concerned, yes, if there were an opportunity for a free people to criticize what the men in the Kremlin were doing, yes, then we could make progress but not while they have iron control, complete despotic control over every item of Soviet life. A few, a handful, of men who are imbued with revolutionary zeal, who have no feeling for true peace so long as they control—no, we can't make progress. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn. Mr. Howe, have you an observation to make before we turn this over to the audience?

Mr. Howe: Well, there were just a couple of points that Mr. Berle made in connection with what I said about his talk—one about the danger of immediate war. I still do not think that is an immediate danger. I again

refer to the present condition of Russia. You see in the papers every day more and more indications of difficulties inside Russia, and every day you hear our generals and admirals lamenting of our unpreparedness for war.

On the matter of the control of the Dardanelles and of Russian ambitions in Eastern Europe, in the first place it does seem—granting the Soviets their particular kind of system—that they have a right to certain advantages and privileges in that part of the world that they have not had before. They've been attacked from that region twice during the last 30 years because they didn't control the Dardanelles and because Eastern Europe did lie open to attack from that quarter—that was why they were twice invaded. I think it is reasonable for them to demand this kind of protection now. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Kaltenborn wants to make one observation.

Mr. Kaltenborn: Just one point on the Dardanelles—we 'concede three of the four major things that the Soviet Union asks. All we do not concede is that Soviet Russia should have complete military control of the Dardanelles. You're right, Russia has privileges there and rights. We grant them—free navigation, complete control for her merchant marines, for her war-

ships, exclusive control of the Black Sea, for the warships of the riparian powers, but no dominant military control so that she can keep everyone out of the Black Sea.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn. Now it's about time to let the audience in on this discussion, so how about drinks of water for all of us all around, while we pause briefly for station identification.

Announcer: Friends, you are listening to America's Town Meeting of the Air, originating in its home in Town Hall, New York. Our topic is, "Is Russia Preventing Peace at Paris?" Mr. A. A. Berle, Jr., Dr. Frederick L. Schuman, Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn, and Mr. Quincy Howe have been having a spirited discussion on this topic. Now we're ready for questions from the audience.

If you would like a complete transcript of this meeting, including the question period to follow, you may secure it by writing to Town Hall, New York 18, New York. Enclose ten cents to cover the cost of printing and mailing.

If you would like to have the Bulletin come to you regularly for an entire year, enclose \$4.50; for 6 months enclose \$2.35; and for 11 weeks, enclose \$1. Be sure to print your name and address plainly, include your zone number, and allow at least two weeks for delivery.

QUESTIONS, PLEASE!

Mr. Denny: Of course, we'll have to rule out the questions by Mr. Kaltenborn and Mr. Howe for this contest, but the rest of you are eligible for a \$25 United States Savings Bond, if you ask the question which our committee of judges considers best among those asked for bringing out facts, and clarifying the discussion. Please limit your questions to 25 words. We'll take the charming blonde up here. Oh, you should see her!

Lady: Mr. Berle, would you say that Russia has any purpose in impeding peace at Paris?

Mr. Berle: Foreign offices are pretty much the same the world over. Yes, I think there are men there who believe that by keeping up the confusion they can territorially profit, particularly in the Near and Far East. That was good Russian policy long before the Soviets were invented.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, now the gentleman over here on the aisle, please.

Man: Dr. Schuman. Isn't it a fact that our American appeasers who favored nazism before and during World War II today are beating war drums against Russia?

Dr. Schuman: Do I understand you to be asking whether the American appeasers who favored nazism are now the same people

who are beating the war drums against Russia? I think there's a high degree of correlation between those two groups. (*Applause.*) I think further there is a very good reason for that, I think if you will examine these people you will see that they are frightened to death of something they call communism, about which they understand very little, but which they make the scapegoat for all of their evils and difficulties.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Kaltenborn has a comment here.

Mr. Kaltenborn: I'd just like to add that appeasement brought Hitler and the second World War. We don't want continued appeasement of another totalitarian regime to bring the Third World War. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The lady over here.

Lady: Mr. Berle. My name is Rose Fell and I teach history.

Mr. Denny: Roosevelt, did you say?

Lady: I wish it were. Rose Fell. (*Laughter.*) Don't you think comparing any action of so valuable a wartime ally as Russia to Hitler and making Bikini tests will still further prevent peace?

Mr. Berle: I'm not sure that any of this business is particularly helpful to peace. It is only fair to observe, however, that all sides are guilty of that sin. The United

States demobilized farther and faster and more completely than any other country in the world, proportionately.

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Berle. Now, the gentleman here.

Man: My question is directed to Mr. Kaltenborn. I'd like to know whether, if the same thing happened to the United States that happened to Russia—the loss of 27 million people left homeless, and millions of people killed—would the people of the United States have the same consideration in the Peace Conference as the people of Russia have.

Mr. Kaltenborn: I think we must have every consideration for the human losses which were suffered by the Soviet Union and, undoubtedly, those tremendous losses have had an important effect upon Russian psychology, but I must also add that some part of those losses was due to the fact that the Soviet Union was in alliance with Adolph Hitler, relied too much on his support, then continued to support him with valuable war materials up to the very day in which he invaded Russia. (*Applause.*)

Man: Mr. Howe. Unless we agree with Mr. Kaltenborn and assume that all governments except the Russians are equipped with wings, do you think it is fair and conducive to peace to think about Russia tonight as the only possible stumbling block to

peace, or do you think tonight's question comes under the heading of divisive propaganda?" (*Applause.*)

Mr. Howe: The subject of the evening is whether Russia is impeding peace at Paris, and if we are not to talk about the activities of the Russians except along with the activities of everybody else at every public forum, then I suppose it is divisive, otherwise, I cannot see any harm in throwing a question like that open to four people who supposedly, and I think really do, present pretty different points of view.

Mr. Denny: All right. The gentleman should probably have directed that question to the moderator. I don't know what he's going to say about the question two weeks from tonight when we discuss the question, "Are We Heading for War With Russia?" But I want to make it perfectly clear to him and to everybody in our listening audience that the purpose of these discussions is to avoid war at all costs. We want to make the best possible use of freedom of speech and honest discussion to air these differences of opinion as they exist and not try to hide them and allow each nation to be propagandized into a position where war is inevitable. (*Applause.*)

The gentleman in the balcony, please.

Man: Mr. Berle said, "It is not yet too late to meet the issues." Specifically, what would you recommend doing in Paris to meet the issues that we are not doing now?

Mr. Berle: Of course, I differ with one premise. I don't think that Paris is so very important. It is what goes on around and outside of Paris all the way from Korea to Stettin that is worrying me.

Could we not agree that there are the defensive lines which the three powers have established and let them stabilize there?

Could we not agree that no one, for the time being, shall cross that line, either directly with arms or indirectly with any of the other ways that they make.

Then could we not agree to get together on a positive policy of doing something to relieve the condition of the masses in these various countries.

Then with a positive policy all-out, economic and social, to back up this defense, we would first stabilize, get away on a positive tack, and maybe, in due time, some of these fears would begin to die away. But you will not get that while there are moves and counter-moves which Professor Schuman believes are defensive and which I think probably arose out of some inflated ambitions—it's immaterial where they came from. You can't do that as long as you have this continuous merry-go-

round and general racket going on. I'm too old, I'm afraid, in the diplomatic life, to assume that a conference is anything but the surface of the situation. It's not Paris we have to look at, it's what goes on below the line. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Berle. The gentleman over there.

Man: Dr. Schuman, do you think that if our present negotiators had the confidence of Russia, we would make better progress today in Paris?

Dr. Schuman: You ask whether you think our present negotiators have the confidence of Russia. I think they do have the confidence of Russia. I think no change in the personnel of the negotiators would change the situation in the slightest. May I just add to that, because I think the matter terribly important, that I personally endorse completely all that Mr. Berle said in answer to the last question. If we can somehow establish lines, if we can somehow accept the situation as it is and put an end to attack and counterattack on both sides, then we can begin to make progress toward world peace and toward world government. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Schuman. The gentleman right here.

Man: I'm a teacher. My question is directed to Mr. Kaltenborn. Mr. Kaltenborn, you said that com-

munism is a one-track minded sort of political belief. In what way does communism differ from our own Republicanism, as a one-track way of life?

Mr. Kaltenborn: Well, in the first place, we're going to have three tracks in New York State and I think we'll have all of four or five in most states in this fall election. It's the moment you get away from the single party system that you get something that we call democracy, which is altogether different from a totalitarian system which exists in a state that's dominated by communism and its principles. I'm surprised that a public school teacher should ask such a question. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Kaltenborn. The gentleman down there in the third row.

Man: My question is for Mr. Howe. Isn't it a lot of— (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: Better get that writing straight. He's turned the card upside down twice. (*Laughter.*) Go ahead.

Man: Isn't much of our present antagonism towards Russia caused by misrepresentation of the press and radio commentators—the unfair presentation of the Russian side by the radio and press?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Howe, I don't know whether you're on the defensive or not.

Mr. Howe: I think I'll answer that in the affirmative. Of course, it is. The press and the radio, being human, are unfair. Human beings are unfair, they're emotional, they're guided by their interests. The interests of the commentators, and the newspaper owners, and the radio stations, and the sponsors are a tangled affair. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Berle: I'd like to add to that. Nothing could be more unfair to Russia than the Russian propaganda and the Russian communist propaganda here. That misrepresents Russia as no one else could. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Berle. Mr. Kaltenborn.

Mr. Kaltenborn: I should also like to recommend to that questioner that he tune in on certain stations which, alas, must be nameless, and on certain commentators who also must be nameless, and he'll get a presentation that the Russians would love. (*Applause and laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: It's too bad that it's contrary to network policy to mention the proper network. The improper commentators, Mr. Kaltenborn corrects me. All right. Now I see some questions up in the balcony. The gentleman with the number two question 'way back. I hope he's got a good voice. All right. I'll take the one with the lighter suit. (*Laughter.*) That's right, you're the one. Don't be modest.

Man: Dr. Schuman, could you explain by specific examples from the past just why the capitalist world and the socialist world fear each other? (*Laughter.*)

Mr. Denny: Dr. Schuman, you have at least two minutes.

Dr. Schuman: Thank you, very much, Mr. Moderator. I should think that if one recognized the fact, in the history of the international socialist movement, that this movement was from the beginning a movement of war and revolution against the social and economic order of capitalism, and if one recognized further that in any effort at achieving socialism, at least by revolutionary means, you had a concerted effort by all so-called capitalist powers to drown the effort in blood, including the Russian revolution, you would have your answer to the question as to why there is mutual hatred and fear.

Of course, if Mr. Kaltenborn is right and if Cardinal Spellman is right, in his piece in the *American Magazine* for last July, that there can be no compromise and no middle ground in world affairs between democratic capitalism and Soviet socialism or communism, then let us be perfectly clear in our own minds that there is no hope whatever for our world. If that is true, there is no hope whatever for our world. (*Applause.*) I regard that proposition obviously as false, because, tonight at least,

I am going to be an optimist, and I think Mr. Berle regards it as false, too.

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Mr. Berle, what did you say?

Mr. Berle: I agree with Professor Schuman. I don't think that there's that necessary conflict. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Mr. Kaltenborn, please.

Mr. Kaltenborn: What I disagree with is that Dr. Schuman says that there is no hope for the world if we admit a fundamental difference and opposition between Soviet communism and American democracy. I do not believe that fundamental conflict is necessarily going to lead to war. There are ideological differences. There have always been. But that doesn't mean that war needs to grow out of them. We were in antagonism to the Soviet Union without recognition for a decade and a half and we didn't imagine for a moment that war would grow out of it. We can agree to disagree. We can be frank about our differences. I think on the contrary that a frank recognition that there can be no mixing of democracy and communism is the surest way to peace and not the surest way to war. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. The young man over on this side, please.

Man: Mr. Berle. How can a

30 1947
small nation really be free of any sphere of influence?

Mr. Denny: Mr. Berle, you can have two minutes.

Mr. Berle: It depends entirely on the self-restraint of the great powers. The plea that I am making here is that until there is that self-restraint, not only will no small nation be free of a sphere of influence, but no large nation will be free from fear of war. That is what has been absent in these last discussions. It is precisely the lack of self-restraint, which, I think, is greater on the Soviet side of course than Professor Schuman does, which has led us to a very, very dangerous situation. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Mr. Berle. The gentleman down here.

Man: Dr. Schuman. Do you believe that the Russian people, if it were put to a vote from them, would back the policy adopted at the present time by the Russians at Paris?

Dr. Schuman: I know of no possible way of answering that. That is a purely speculative question. If you ask how I think or how anybody thinks the Russian people would vote if they voted in a free vote, then, perhaps, your opinion is just as good as mine. My opinion is that they would support their present leaders and their present government and the present policy pursued in Paris,

but I can't prove that, nor can you disprove it nor can anyone else.

Mr. Denny: All right, Dr. Schuman. I think Mr. Berle has an observation to make at this point.

Mr. Berle: We approach the close of the debate. I should like to have it noted that the two supposed antagonists have both agreed that there is no predominance of right or wrong here and, indeed, that that's not the question.

In view of a grave situation with armed men facing each other, and fleets counter marching and marching, wild tongues and wild claims, what is needed is that there shall be an end of this and that a voice shall be found for the voiceless who fought our common war, that they shall not be condemned to death in a new war by reason of their own victory.

That means that some of the dynamics of communism will have to cease. It means that some of the imperialism of the 19th century will have finally to die. It means all of those things and it will be hard for all parties, but it can be done. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you. Dr. Schuman!

Dr. Schuman: Again I find myself in concurrence with my supposed antagonist on this program tonight. I should like to leave you with only one final thought. It seems to me that the fundamental difficulty here is the recurrence of

the ancient game of power politics and that game cannot in the long run be ended by mere self-restraint. It cannot be ended by the Atlantic Charter or the good neighbor policy. It can be ended finally only by making the beginning of establishing world government. That's what we must aim at. (*Applause.*)

Mr. Denny: Thank you, Dr. Schuman, Mr. Berle, Mr. Kaltenborn, and Mr. Howe. Now while Mr. Kirby gives us the news about our next two meetings, the committee of judges will come to a decision about tonight's best question.

Announcer: Next week, we turn to No. 1 domestic problem—homes for veterans. Our topic will be: "Should Commercial Building Be Curtailed for Homes for Veterans?" Mr. Wilson Wyatt, National Housing Expediter and Administrator, and Peter Grimm, director of the Citizens' Housing Council of New York City and chairman of the Board of the real estate firm of William A. White

and Son, will take opposite sides on this question. Mr. H. V. Kaltenborn and Mr. Quincy Howe will be our special interrogators.

The following week we take up almost where we left off with tonight's meeting with a critical examination of the foreign policy of the U.S.A. and U.S.S.R. under the title, "Are We Heading for War With Russia?"

The distinguished chairman of the British Labor Party, Mr. Harold Laski, will be one of our speakers. Mr. Ely Culbertson, author and lecturer, and Mr. Quincy Howe will be our special interrogators. Another speaker will be announced.

Mr. Denny: Our committee of judges advises me that the question which wins the \$25 United States Savings Bond is: "What would you recommend, Mr. Berle, doing in Paris to meet the issues that we are not doing now? This questions was submitted by Mr. Carl A. Kallgren of Colgate University, Hamilton, N.Y. Congratulations, Mr. Kallgren. (*Applause.*)

EDITOR'S NOTE: In the Town Meeting Bulletin for August 29, 1946, the editor misquoted both Napoleon and Senator Brewster. On page 23, last paragraph, the quotation should read: "One bad general is better than two good generals."

On page 24, next to last paragraph, P. E. Beaver should read F. E. Bieber.

Apologies to Napoleon, Senator Brewster, and F. E. Bieber.

APR 30 1947



Town Meeting Bulletin

ISSUES NOW IN STOCK

Order by number from the list below while they last—

VOLUME 11

35. What Should Be Our Policy in China?
36. What Must We Do To Denazify the German People?
37. Should Congress Approve the Proposed Loan to Britain?
39. Can We Find a Substitute for Strikes?
40. Which Way to Full Employment?
41. Do We Need More Democracy in Our Armed Forces?
43. Are Parents or Society Responsible for Juvenile Crime?
45. What Must We Do To Help Feed Europe?
46. Do Our Movies Tend To Raise or Lower Our Moral Standards?
47. Have Britain and America Any Reason To Fear Russia?
48. Who Should Control the Production and Use of Atomic Energy?
49. Should We Continue the Draft Beyond May 15?
50. What Are the Real Issues Behind the Russian-Iranian Dispute?
51. Is Franco Spain a Threat to World Peace?
52. What Should Be Our Policy Toward Russia?

VOLUME 12

1. What Can We As Individuals Do To Help Prevent World Famine?
3. Science—Salvation or Destroyer of Mankind?
8. Does the United Nations Give a Reasonable Guarantee of Peace?
9. Is Food Rationing Necessary To Prevent World Starvation?
10. Should the Baruch Proposals Be Adopted?
11. Should the Veto Be Abolished in the United Nations?
12. Can We Have World Peace Without World Law?
13. Can We Keep on Friendly Terms With Russia?
14. How Can Germany Be United?
15. Is the Veteran Getting a Square Deal in Education?
16. How Can Peace Be Brought to Palestine?
17. Can Free Competition Now Prevent Inflation?
18. Will America Progress More Under Republican or Democratic Leadership?

Order single copies at 10c each from TOWN HALL, INC.,
123 West 43rd St., New York 18, N.Y.

Twenty-six Consecutive Issues of Town Meeting Bulletin Will be Sent at This Special Low Subscription Rate: { 26 Weeks for Only **\$2.35** Single Copies 10c